

## 4.5 Evaluation Factors

The Evaluation Team will use seven factors to evaluate the information provided in response to this RFQ. These factors are listed here in descending order of importance: (1) Experience, (2) Preliminary Concept, (3) Financial Capabilities, (4) Organizational Capabilities, (5) Past Performance, (6) Financial Return, and (7) Small Business Concerns as Subcontractors. The Evaluation Team's assessment of this information will form the basis for a recommendation to the Selection Official. In conducting its evaluation, the Evaluation Team will address the following subfactors and questions. The subfactors and questions for each factor will be comprehensively evaluated to arrive at an overall factor rating, which will analyze the developer's ability to plan and implement the Fort Hood Project.

### 4.5.1 Experience

**Does the prospective developer meet the minimum experience requirements set forth in section 4.2?**

For firms that meet these minimum requirements, the following subfactors will be evaluated:

- To what extent has the developer demonstrated through experience the ability to plan, develop, redevelop, manage, and maintain large-scale residential development projects, including providing for their construction, financing, and long-term operation?
- To what extent has the developer demonstrated through experience the ability to serve as a developer and partner in working with the federal government, state or local governments, or non-profit institutions?
- To what extent has the developer demonstrated the ability through experience to renovate housing units while residents occupy units in some portion of the same development project?
- To what extent has the developer demonstrated through experience, and in relation to its approach to managing the Fort Hood project, the ability to work successfully in cooperation with other business entities or organizations on complex projects requiring long-term real estate operation, maintenance, and property management?

This last subfactor evaluates the extent to which a single-firm developer has worked with other organizations (e.g., subcontractors, financial institutions, etc.) on projects requiring long-term real estate operation, maintenance, and property management functions. In the case of a development team, this last subfactor also evaluates the extent to which the team's principal members have experience working

together or with other organizations on these projects in joint ventures or similar types of business relationships.

#### 4.5.2 Preliminary Concept

**Has the prospective developer provided a creative, robust vision that meets the Army's needs and signals a successful outcome?**

This factor considers the prospective developer's overall concept for the long-term development, operation, maintenance, and property management of the military family housing community at Fort Hood, and the developer's creativity in meeting the Army's objectives. In reviewing a developer's preliminary concept, the Evaluation Team will consider the following questions:

- Does the prospective developer understand the Army's goals and needs for the Fort Hood project as identified in Section 1.1 of this solicitation?
- Is the developer's approach to the Fort Hood project, including its plan for reinvestment and its plan for providing quality long-term operation, maintenance, and property management, practical and likely to succeed from a long-term business and financial standpoint?
- Is the developer's methodology and approach to integrating the Army's needs and the developer's capabilities consistent with the Army's overall community development goals for the project as set forth in Section 1.1?
- Do all ancillary supporting facilities proposed as part of the overall project concept relate to and support housing? Similarly, to what extent are proposed ancillary supporting facilities incorporated into an overall development vision that seeks to complement business operations in the local community or on-post operations such as those run by MWR activities and organizations such as AAFES or DeCA (see Section 2.1.1)?

#### 4.5.3 Financial Capabilities

**Can the prospective developer structure, arrange, and manage the financing required for a large, complex, long-term development and operating project?**

In reviewing financial capabilities, the Evaluation Team will consider the following questions:

- Does the prospective developer possess the financial capability and institutional relationships necessary to obtain financing for a project of this size and scope and to weather temporary or near-term cash flow shortfalls?
- Does the prospective developer have a viable strategy for financing the Fort Hood project on a long-term basis, and is the strategy supported by the developer's identified capabilities?

#### 4.5.4 Organizational Capabilities

**To what extent can the prospective developer field a qualified, experienced project team with the expertise and workload capacity necessary to manage all of the disciplines required to plan, develop, redevelop, manage, and maintain a large-scale residential community development project?**

More specifically, to what extent can the prospective developer field a team to cover all of the disciplines – including business planning, master planning, financing, public approvals, community and governmental relations, construction, marketing, sales, rentals, and long-term property management and maintenance – that must be brought to bear in making a project like Fort Hood successful over the long-term?

This factor considers the prospective developer's ability to manage and integrate various functional disciplines relevant to the successful planning and implementation of the Fort Hood project. Technical skills such as design, engineering, and construction, which can be readily procured by the developer through subcontracting, will not be evaluated as part of the review of the developer team. In the case of development teams, this factor evaluates the organizational capabilities of each member of the team in their assigned areas of responsibility (See Section 4.3.4).

#### 4.5.5 Past Performance

**How acceptable is the prospective developer's risk of non-performance or poor performance in either crafting or implementing the CDMF for the Fort Hood project, based on past performance?**

The Army's evaluation of past performance will be based on information provided by the prospective developer as required in Section 4.3.5, as well as on independent background analyses. References identified in developer submissions, and by third parties, may be contacted as part of this evaluation. The Army's analysis of the developer's past performance will take into account the currency and relevancy of information examined, the context of the data, and general trends in the developer's performance.

Consistent with Section 4.3.1, the past performance for a development team will consider both the team's past performance and that of its principal members. Developers and principal members in a development team that lack a past performance history will be given a neutral past performance evaluation.

#### 4.5.6 Financial Return

**How and to what extent will the developer's expected financial return (taking into account the proposed ownership structure, reinvestment plan, and use of MHPI authorities) enable the Army to improve the quality of the**

## **residential community development at Fort Hood and the quality of life for soldiers and families living on the Installation?**

As part of this question, the Army will consider how the developer's proposed approach to generating a financial return provides incentives to reward good service and high-quality maintenance over the life of the Fort Hood project. Information concerning a developer's expected financial return, including the developer's proposed use of MHPI authorities as evaluated under OMB scoring rules, will be treated by the Army as cost or price information likely to affect the level or quality of improvements in the housing community at Fort Hood. As such, this information will be taken into account in developer evaluations. However, cost or price will not be the primary determinant of developer selection.

The effect of implementing a developer's concept under OMB scoring rules will be taken into account by the Army in answering this question and will affect developer evaluations.

### **4.5.7 Small Business Concerns as Subcontractors**

#### **How has the prospective developer used small business concerns in past projects, and how will it use small business concerns for this project?**

It is Army policy in the RCI pilot program to ensure that small business concerns have the maximum practicable opportunity to participate during implementation of the CDMP. The subfactors of past and planned use of small businesses will be evaluated.